

CAGE

E

449

.H 7904

1863



3 1151 02543 6498







CASE  
E449  
H7904  
1863

Lundy, John Patterson,

REVIEW OF BISHOP HOPKINS'

Bible View of Slavery,

BY

A PRESBYTER OF THE CHURCH

IN

PHILADELPHIA.



5161/101/113M

# REVIEW

OF

## Bishop Hopkins' Political Pamphlet on Slavery,

BY A PRESBYTER OF THE CHURCH, IN PHILADELPHIA.

---

THE venerable Bishop of Vermont tells us that his "gray hairs admonish him that he may soon be called to give an account of his stewardship," in a singular pamphlet which is marked No. 8 of "*Papers from the Society for the Diffusion of Political Knowledge*," whose office is at No. 13 Park Row, New York. This pamphlet, in which the Bishop speaks so seriously of his approaching destiny is not a sermon, but a political document, specially written for political purposes, in reply to a letter of inquiry from notorious politicians in Philadelphia; and is published by a political society in New York for distribution throughout the Free States; but more especially in Pennsylvania, as it would seem, to affect the elections. It is a strange thing indeed, and bears the marks of inconsistency for a Bishop, whose gray hairs admonish him of his final accountability, not to be admonished of the manifest impropriety of entering the political arena at so late a day, and especially after having so conscientiously refused to sit with his brother Bishops in the last General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church, while a pastoral letter was being read which he deemed too political. It would have been well, too, had the Bishop been furthermore admonished of the indecorum, not to say impertinence, of entering another Bishop's diocese with such a pamphlet as this, without first having obtained permission, according to the laws of the Church, and especially a diocese which has received and treated Bishop Hopkins with so much *substantial* consideration. No wonder the worthy Bishop of Pennsylvania and his clergy protested against this interference and political intermeddling with the affairs of his diocese and of their several charges; and no wonder that protest, so earnest and so decided, has



awakened all the malice and the hatred of those Democrats and political Churchmen, yeleft, Copperheads. But since the Bishop's private admissions extend only to this one specific thing of final accountability, while he altogether overlooks or ignores the less important matters of worldly prudence and discretion, even though, as he tells us, "more than forty years have elapsed since he ceased even to attend the polls," it may be permitted to some of his juniors to remind him that his political pamphlet fully makes up for all the mischief which a forty years' attendance on the polls might have caused, and that it is one of the most flattering unctious ever laid to the guilty soul of slavery: "From the Word of God there can be no appeal," the Bishop tells us; of course there cannot; but from the Bishop's *interpretation* of that word, so much at variance with the universal interpretation of Christendom, there can be a most serious appeal. Is the Bishop infallible?

Bishop Hopkins entirely disclaims any responsibility as to the use which a political faction is now making of his pamphlet, published, as he says, before the present troubles had taken shape, and before he knew the attitude which the South would take. It is a useless disclaimer; because he does not deny its authorship, or that it was written in response to an application made to him by notorious politicians in Philadelphia. He must have been aware that it would be used to accomplish certain political ends, and therefore he cannot evade responsibility in the matter, even the responsibility of causing disaffection and discord in the diocese of Pennsylvania. It is a political hurdy-gurdy which he has manufactured; and because it so exactly suited this political faction which is now and has been making such discordant and horrible music with it in this Commonwealth and in the Church itself, he must meet the responsibility like a man and stand up to its full measure of indignant protest. Bishop Potter and his Clergy have a perfect right to protest against this intermeddling; they would not be faithful to their trust unless they did. And shall one Bishop engage in a political controversy which seriously affects the peace and the interests of another Bishop's diocese, and shall this last have no voice in protesting against it? Fair play is a jewel, and the shoe may be placed on the other foot. It is for this reason that the writer of this review signed the protest with his Bishop.

Bishop Hopkins' pamphlet is made up of several groundless assumptions and assertions, and of attempted answers to certain objections made against the advocates of slavery. The first assumption is that slavery being "*a servitude for life, descending to the offspring,*" (the definition and the italics are the Bishop's) has "existed as an established institution in all ages of our world, by the universal evidence of history, whether sacred or profane;" that it "was sanctioned by the Deity" and "authorized by the Almighty." (Page 2.) The Bishop's pamphlet has for



the first time entirely convinced the writer of this review that slavery is an accursed thing in itself, and that it originated in a prophetic curse; but it has not convinced him that it is an institution existing in *all* ages of the world, sanctioned and authorized by the good God. Sacred history is the most rational account of the creation of the world and of mankind, and it contains not one word about slavery as an original institution in the garden of Eden. Marriage was there instituted, so was worship and work, as the necessary basis of the family, the church and the state. If slavery had been necessary to the existence of society in church and state, or in the family, then slaves would have been created to dress and to keep the garden, (Gen. 2: 15.) But no slaves were thus created for this purpose, and the work of dressing and keeping the garden was specially assigned to Adam. Slavery therefore is not an original institution existing in all ages of the world, sanctioned and authorized by the Deity, as marriage, worship and work were; and for more than *two thousand years* of the world's existence there is no evidence at all in the Sacred History that slavery had any existence. Man was made to do his own work, and from the little evidence that we have of the state of society before the flood, it is plain that it had attained to a high degree of civilization in the arts, without the institution of slavery. How then can Bishop Hopkins affirm that slavery has existed "in *all* ages of our world, by the universal evidence of history, whether sacred or profane?" The homely distich

"When Adam delv'd and Eve span  
Where was then the gentleman?"

would have taught him better than this, if he had any disposition to learn the truth on this point. And the existence of human society for more than two thousand years in a high state of civilization without slavery as an established institution, is an exception to his sweeping assertion that it has existed in *all* ages of the world. Slavery is a thing wholly incident to man in a fallen state, and it was simply a development of man's inherent depravity and wickedness. God never instituted it. He simply allowed it to be, as He allows other evils, we do not know why. He simply made it a punishment of man's sin, which is purely a temporary and earthly punishment, as the deluge was. He never meant it to be eternal. Hell is the eternal bondage and punishment of sin, and hell only. Who ever before heard that God's institutions for man's welfare in society originated in a curse? It is quite a novelty in theology, and altogether an original discovery. God's institutions are meant to be blessings, if men will use them rightly. When, therefore, Bishop Hopkins asserts that "the first appearance of slavery in the Bible is the wonderful prediction of the patriarch Noah," recorded in Genesis ix. 25 v.: "Cursed be Canaan, a servant of servants shall he be to his brethren,"

he is quite right as to the origin of slavery, but his inferences are wholly wrong. "*Servant of servants*" in the original Hebrew simply means, according to Gesenius, "the lowest menial," whether he be a slave or only a hired servant. And in the Septuagint translation it means a "*house servant or slave*;" one born in the house as a menial or living in the house in that capacity. Granting the Bishop his premise that it means slave in our acceptation of the word, it still remains for him to prove that Noah's prophetic curse has any reference at all to the perpetual bondage of the African race. On this point theologians, as learned and as profound as Bishop Hopkins, differ with him in opinion. This curse entailed as a punishment on Canaan, doubtless because he inherited more than Ham's other children, his father's peculiarly corrupt, and ungrateful, and unfilial disposition, is thought to have been fully accomplished when the wicked, and licentious, and idolatrous Canaanites were conquered by the Israelites, and made their "hewers of wood and drawers of water." The settlement of Africa by *unmixed* descendants of Ham is still a debated question, and therefore Bishop Hopkins must show conclusively that Noah's prophetic curse has any other reference than to the Canaanites whom Israel reduced to bondage, and that Africa was wholly settled by Ham's posterity. The African race has for ages been a weak and dependent race; but so have other races of men been. It is from the African race that slaves have been chiefly obtained in modern times; but that is no reason why they alone of all mankind have been doomed to perpetual servitude by the Almighty. The argument proves too much. Other races have been made slaves by stronger powers in times past, and it is from the Circassian race that Mohammedanism chiefly obtains its slaves. Are these included in the curse of Noah? If not, then slavery exists elsewhere and independent of this curse, and the Bishop must account for it otherwise than as a *Divine institution*, originating elsewhere, and not for the only time in Noah's malediction on Canaan. It is simply an evil which is its own punishment.

The next important assumption which Bishop Hopkins makes as to the Divine institution of slavery, is, that the moral law, the "Ten Commandments delivered from Mount Sinai," sanctions *property*, not only in slaves, but in wives and children, oxen and asses. Hear him in the assertion of this monstrous dogma: "It is evident that the principle of *property*—'anything that is thy neighbor's'—runs through the whole," (p. 2.) According to this, a man's wife and children are as much his property as his houses and lands, his bonds and mortgages, his cattle and merchandise; and if he chooses, he may sell the one as well as the other. He may at any time dissolve the marriage bond and dispose of his children, which God has made perpetually binding, and whom He has intrusted to parental care and affection forever, just as he may part with a

refractory horse or a bale of goods, or a share of poor railroad stock. The Bishop has good reason to hold the supposition that such a doctrine as this, is liable to "the prejudice which many good people entertain against the idea of *property*, in a human being," (p. 2;) and it is most likely that the wives and children, husbands and parents, who learn this exposition of the moral Law may have some prejudice against it. How would the Bishop like to sell his wife and children to the highest bidder at a Richmond auction block? If as a good man he might entertain a prejudice against the idea, then other good men may be privileged to do the same thing, without incurring the charge of fanaticism. This exposition of the moral Law is as much of a novelty, as the other assertion that slavery is a Divine institution existing in all ages of the world; and we give the Bishop credit for his originality in the one case as in the other. The whole thing is so absurd on this point, that it needs only to be stated in order to be refuted. The Bishop is so hard-pressed to quote Scripture for his purpose, that he lugs in the moral Law to bolster up his monstrous theory of property in human beings, even wives and children; when the moral Law has nothing at all to do with the subject. Perhaps he has discovered somewhere that this part of the Law, which forbids coveting, applies only to white people, and that the black race is an exception to the rule—that there may be property in *black* slaves, but not in *white* ones. If so, he will doubtless enlighten us again, when his gray hairs admonish him so to do.

Again, the Bishop assures us very explicitly and gravely that the Levitical law expressly sanctions slavery as a Divine institution. This law is based on the higher moral Law, and cannot contravene or contradict it. He quotes several passages from the books of Exodus and Leviticus, to justify his position, which have nothing more to do with the subject than this, viz., that they are rules for *the regulation of slavery* as it existed in the Hebrew commonwealth, and for *the benefit of the slave*. Slaves were not to be cast out helpless on the world after having served their masters, and so the masters are charged to provide for them. The law also regulated polygamy and divorce; but no one will venture to assert, except a Mohammedan and a Mormon, that polygamy and divorce are Divine institutions. As God at first made only one wife for a man and no slaves, so it was His intention that he should have only one wife and no slaves. Polygamy and divorce arose against this Divine intention and institution of marriage out of man's depravity, just as slavery did; and the law was given to regulate both, and to set some bounds and limitations to human passion and caprice. The very existence of the law is a proof of its necessity, for it applies only to the lawless and the sinful; and if both polygamy and slavery had not been sinful and needed regulation, the law would not have been given for the purpose. To quote all that the Bishop says on

the Levitical Law as justifying the institution of slavery, would be to occupy too much space; and with this principle of its interpretation we must refer the reader to the Episcopal political document itself. (pp. 2-4.).

But we have not yet reached the depths of this profound quagmire into which the toiling and struggling Bishop would lead us. After quoting all that the Old Testament says expressly on the subject of slavery, he turns to the New; and brings forth what Christ and his apostles have to do or not to do, with it. And all this part of his political pamphlet is so shocking to every principle of charity and good-will to men, that it needs special refutation. A sophomore, in his first College essay, might make this refutation easily, and even then do himself no great credit. And will it be believed by sensible men that Bishop Hopkins puts in capital letters as a most important and unanswerable proposition, our Lord's entire silence on the subject of slavery as a justification of it? And yet he does this very thing with an air of complete self-satisfaction and triumph. Hear him: "We ask what the Divine Redeemer said in reference to slavery. And the answer is perfectly undeniable: HE DID NOT ALLUDE TO IT AT ALL." (p. 4.) What of it? Is silence always to be construed into assent? And can silence be fairly and always justly interpreted as meaning assent and justification? Not at all. Our Lord says nothing at all about the Jewish Sabbath passing over into the Christian Sunday; but is that any reason why He approved or disapproved of the change? He says nothing at all about suicide; but is that any reason why He approved and justified it? He says nothing at all about polygamy, although He speaks of marriage; but is that any reason why He sanctioned it? The words, Sunday, suicide and polygamy, are not once reported as ever having fallen from His lips; and yet the principles of His blessed religion are sufficiently explicit as to the things themselves. Upon what principle of interpretation, then, does Bishop Hopkins affirm that our Lord's silence on the subject of slavery in the Roman Empire, which by the way was not wholly African slavery, can be construed into its justification, any more than His silence on the matters of a change in the Jewish Sabbath, suicide and polygamy, can be construed for or against them? Silence here is a poor argument in favor of slavery, and the Bishop is certainly very ingenious, but not so ingenuous in making it serve his purpose. The Christian religion is but the full completion and development of the Jewish, and its abiding principles are one and the same throughout. All Revelation is a unit, showing us our duties to God and man. This Revelation was made complete and final in Jesus Christ and by Him; and therefore the Christian religion must be consistent with God's original revelations in Eden, and under the Patriarchal and Mosaic systems. It is designed to restore man's lost innocence and happiness, and is meant for the whole race, and for no particular part of it.



If, then, slavery was not established in Eden as a Divine institution, but only grew up after man's apostacy, and long after, it is certainly no part of Christianity to sanction it, but to do it away and to restore mankind to its original state as it existed in Eden. Our Lord was no politician, although He was a good and loyal citizen of the Roman empire, because his kingdom was not of this world; and it would have utterly defeated His benevolent design in establishing His religion in the earth, if He had mingled in politics, interfered in any way with existing institutions, or allowed Himself to be drawn into any political and partisan complications. His was therefore a more prudent silence on the subject of slavery, than Bishop Hopkins has shown in the publication of his pamphlet; and if this too zealous disciple and representative of the Great Bishop of souls had but imitated His example, it would not have caused such an agitation on this subject as now convulses both Church and State in our unhappy country. It is enough to say that all Christendom, including even Russia, has at length utterly repudiated slavery as an abomination and an evil too intolerable to be endured longer, as to the estimate which Christianity places upon human bondage, and as to the bounden duty which she esteems it to get rid of the evil. It is a system which only lingers in Christian America, and which is now going down to the pit of infamy and depravity from which it came, as fast as the awful civil war in which we are now engaged can send it. If it does not finally perish from the earth in this fearful contest, then God have mercy on our people, and on the poor black race! This war has drawn the sword which will cut this knotty question of slavery in twain, and relieve the anxieties of our statesmen as to the future destiny of our country.

After Bishop Hopkins has so triumphantly vindicated slavery by reason of our Lord's entire silence on the subject, he goes on to speak of His having come to fulfil the Mosaic law, and all its requirements about slavery. Of course He did; but in a widely different manner from that which the Bishop would have us believe He adopted. Christ came to fill up the dead form of the letter of the Mosaic law with his own divine and living spirit; and this spirit is so pre-eminently one of mercy, kindness, love, and good will to the poor, the oppressed and the downcast of our race, as to make it most certain that human bondage, save for crime, was never intended to be the normal condition of any portion of the human family. Christ came to do away every curse entailed upon mankind, by reason of sin, the curse in which slavery originated included; and to proclaim and effect freedom to every captive and bondman, both as to soul and body. He came to carry out and complete the true intent of all Divine Law, which is to bring men everywhere to Christ for salvation—for restoration to a lost innocence and happiness. To be free from sin is indeed the only true freedom of soul; but to be free from the curse of

sin as it affects the body and the social position, is also no inconsiderable part of the liberty wherewith Christ makes His people free. We have already seen that it was the design of the Levitical law to regulate slavery for the benefit of the slave, and to restrain the passion and caprice of the master; and to carry out and complete this benevolent design in Christianity, it is necessary that slavery be done away altogether. Perpetuate it as it existed in Hebrew times, and the same law must be perpetuated for its regulation: if an advance is to be made in social and religious life, by an express revelation to the world in Jesus Christ, then it is obvious that the Levitical law, and slavery with it, must give place to the higher law of the one original Lawgiver. This higher law is the law of Love, which forbids wrong, oppression and injustice to any man, black or white, brown or red; and which charges us to do to others as we would have them do to us. It is indeed a beautiful illustration of the mutual love which Bishop Hopkins affirms to exist between the masters and slaves of the South, that mounted patrols must guard plantation and district from plunder, arson, rape and murder; and that blood hounds must be kept to bring back escaping fugitives to the lash, to work and to happiness! There may be instances of kindness and watchful care, just as there may be for horses and cattle, and for the same reason, of self-interest; but that there is any general regard for the slaves as rational, accountable and immortal beings, or as anything different from valuable property, is denied by those who have long lived where slavery exists in its perfection and very best developments. Christianity addresses itself to all men without distinction of color, race, rank or station, as immortal and accountable beings; and therefore slavery is as incompatible with its just and merciful spirit as anything can well be conceived to be.

After exhausting the Gospels, and finding there only silence on the subject of slavery, Bishop Hopkins next turns to the Pauline Epistles to see if he can find anything more than silence to favor his "Bible view of slavery." He quotes a few passages here and there as to the relative duties of master and servant, which, while they recognise service and labor as necessarily existing, do not give the least intimation that slavery is a Divine institution, or that human bondage is made perpetual in the African race. All these passages quoted from St. Paul's Epistles are simply rules for the regulation of the conduct of both master and slave towards each other, just as the Levitical Law on this point was; and they give no hint whatever that *unpaid, unrequited labor is a perpetual principle of God's just government*. If the Bishop had only turned to the Epistle of St. James, and read in the fifth chapter the heavy woes denounced against those rich men, "The hire of whose labourers that have reaped down their fields, which is of them kept back by fraud, crieth; and the cries of them which have reaped are entered into the ears of the

Lord of Sabbaoth," it is most likely that he might have obtained some hint of what a just and righteous God lays down as a fundamental principle of His Kingdom. The labourer is worthy of his hire, be he white or be he black, be he slave or be he freeman; and to withhold that hire in any case is a violation of this principle, and must recoil sooner or later on him who withholds it, with righteous severity. God is the avenger of all wrongs like this, and He will repay. If He is now repaying the South in the desolation of its fair fields, in the impoverishing of its rich planters, and in the liberation of thousands of slaves, it is but a just recompense, for which all good men may be devoutly thankful.

Thus Bishop Hopkins goes through the Bible from Genesis to Revelation, picking out all that seems to favor his view of slavery as a Divine institution; but taking no notice whatever of anything in its sacred pages that militates against it. He never condescends to consider the matter of Israel's bondage in Egypt, and of their wonderful deliverance by the direct interposition of God; for this would not have served his purpose. This deliverance is the type of freedom for all God's children, both in body and soul, as it shall ultimately be effected by the interposition of the Gospel of Christ in this world's iniquitous despotisms. Bishop Hopkins is well aware of this, and hence his singular and judicious omission of this subject in his political pamphlet.

And now we have followed the Bishop to the centre of his dark and tangled bog of assumption and perversion. What does he do next? He comes to a spot where the phosphorescent light is somewhat more abundant, and he tosses it about with remarkable vigor. He surrounds himself with as much brilliancy as is possible under the circumstances, and fairly glows and shines in purple punk. The Declaration of Independence declares that "all men are born free and equal, and are endowed with certain inalienable rights," &c. The Bishop declares that he "has never been able to comprehend that these are truths at all," (p. 7.) None are so blind as they who will not see. He even asserts that "this most popular dogma is fallacious in itself, and only mischievous in its tendencies," (p. 11.) He is bold enough to insinuate that it had its origin in the infidel doctrines of the French Encyclopedists, which latter proclaimed *Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity*, THE RIGHTS OF MAN, as the battle cry of the first Revolution in France, (p. 9;) although he is discriminating enough to see the difference between the revolution of the American Colonies against the mother Country, and this first atheistical French revolution. If the Bishop will turn to Farrar's recent work on the "History of Free Thought," page 194, of Appleton's Edition, he will find that one of the causes which produced atheism and its consequent revolution in France, was the position of the church and her bishops and clergy on the side of a most terrible, corrupt and intolerable despotism of



the state. The church, as the exponent of Christianity, had become wholly secular; she was no longer the Kingdom of Christ in works of charity and good will to men; she had become the instrument of cruelty and injustice and oppression; and no wonder that thinking men judged of Christ's religion by her character and acts as allied with the state. And God meant that the church should suffer for this apostacy and be brought back to her original position and calling, by the terrors of that dreadful revolution. He meant to bring good out of this great evil, just as He brought the world's salvation out of the horrors of the Crucifixion. No one will justify the French revolution for this reason, any more than he will justify the Crucifixion; but the whole thing shows that when Bishops and Clergy depart from their strictly spiritual functions and become politicians and oppressors of mankind, they must pay the penalty of all apostates. The rights of man can never be trampled down with impunity, even by Bishops; men may be so driven to despair and forget the obligations of religion when this is done, as to hurl Bishops and religion from their seats to a deep though temporal destruction. And Bishop Hopkins' attempt to do this very thing by justifying slavery on Bible principles, may yet have something to do with intensifying the awful convulsion now going on amongst us, and bring his church into serious trouble.

The consideration of the Declaration of Independence occupies almost as much space in the Bishop's political pamphlet as the Bible does, showing that he considers it of importance to meet its doctrine of human equality as he best can. He rises to positive grandiloquence on matters that have no possible connexion with its doctrine of *political* equality and citizenship. The bodies of men are unequal in stature and strength; the Esquimaux or Hottentot are not socially what American statesmen or British peers are; men differ intellectually; their inalienable rights are forfeited by imprisonment, by violence, by accident, and by unhappy marriages; rulers and ruled are not equal; Hindoos, Tartars, &c., are not equal to Saxons; there are thrones, dominions, principalities and powers in heavenly places in a grand system of order and gradation; mountains and rivers, beasts and birds are unequal; there is "monarchy in the beehive, and aristocracy in the ant-hill;" flies have no government at all;" minerals shine with unequal lustre, and precious stones sparkle with unequal and varied brilliancy; the mammoth cave and the minutest crystal, the mountains of granite and sand-hills, are all unequal, &c., &c.; but what has all this bombast to do with the Declaration of Independence? Thomas Jefferson is generally supposed to have drawn this instrument for the American colonies, and not for the whole Universe of God. It is reasonably thought to be a political state paper, and not a small Bible. Its theory is, that invented and factitious distinctions between citizens,

and titled nobility, and hereditary monarchy, are not of the nature of human rights originally bestowed upon mankind—but that they are pure inventions simply tolerated. The Hebrew nation was constituted without a king; and God was angry when the people became tired of His sole sovereignty and desired a human king in His place. All their troubles began with this human kingdom, and never ceased till the nation was finally destroyed. Thomas Jefferson and the signers of the Declaration of Independence were indeed slave-holders, but they did not wish slavery to be perpetual in the new state which they had met to form; and hence their agreement to the proposition that all men are born free and equal, in a political point of view. Surely they had brains enough—and so has every plow-boy who goes on the Fourth of July to hear the Declaration read—to perceive the real meaning of that instrument as entitling all citizens to the *equal right and privilege of choosing law-makers and rulers, or of being chosen to office*; and surely they all had enough sense to perceive the difference between a mountain and a mole-hill, a whale and a minnow, an eagle and a bat, a lion and a mouse, or a Bacon and a Hopkins.

But the Bishop tells us that the Declaration of Independence is now “*no part of our present system*” of organic law, (page 10,) and that its doctrine of human political equality is not at all binding. It is an “absurd proceeding,” and an “unmitigated perversity,” for our orators, preachers and politicians to say that it is either true or binding, (p. 10.) What a subterfuge is this! The seven years’ war of Independence grew out of this Declaration. The Constitution of the United States and a new independent nation were the result of it. It is the great Charter of our present liberties and national prosperity. It will remain as an integral part of our nationality as long as that nationality endures. To set it aside would be to set aside our very existence, and commit national suicide. The Bishop’s hostility to that immortal instrument may only pass away with his life; he may sleep on in entire inability to perceive its self-evident truths, as Rip Van Winkle slept through the Revolution; but for all that, the world will move on; the present war of freedom against despotism, of civilization against barbarism, will accomplish its purpose; and the drowsy Bishop may yet live to see, if he will rub his eyes a little when he wakes up, a new sign-board in Burlington—the Washington of Emancipation, instead of the King George of Slavery—and the whole aspect of affairs in our country totally changed.

There is one objection against the *cruelty* of slavery which the Bishop attempts to answer that is almost too monstrous for belief, coming as it does from a man of God and a high teacher of Christianity. The slaves are lashed at whipping-posts for refractory conduct, men and women; and this is justified by the example of Christ driving the traders from the

Temple with a whip of small cords! (p. 11.) Was Christ *THEN whipping slaves into submission?* Had His act any possible connexion with slavery? He had just been acknowledged as the Messiah, and as such He was coming to take possession of the royal palace and temple of his spiritual kingdom, the House of Prayer for all nations. He found bad men there who were not slaves, but Jewish freemen, profaning the Temple with their merchandise, and perverting it from its original purpose; and His authoritative act was simply one of restoration and of purging the Temple. A whip was necessary to drive out the cattle and the sheep, as well as to punish those who kept them there for sale contrary to the law; but it was not a whip designed to reduce the African race to submission to Southern task-masters. Bishop Hopkins may, if he choose, use a whip to drive profane Abolitionists out of his church, after his Lord's example; but he may not use it on the bare backs of poor slaves crying him to have mercy, and justify his cruel act by this proceeding at the Temple. And we recommend him to add to his other symbols of office—viz.: his mitre, his crosier, and his cross—a good stout whip, as a terror to all Eastern Abolitionists. It will keep them in order, and be apt to keep them out of his church forever. The lashing of slaves justified and approved by the example of Christ at the Temple, is simply an unconscious and unintentional blasphemy, for which we pray the good Christ that the Bishop may be forgiven.

Three other objections against slavery the Bishop would fain answer, viz., *its barbarity, its sin, and its property in man*. It is the interest of the master to treat his slaves kindly, just as it is his interest to treat his horses and cows kindly. And is self-interest the basis of morality and of all civilization? Bishop Butler will teach Bishop Hopkins a better doctrine than that. Righteousness, as a fundamental principle against all self-interest, is the basis of all religion, morality and Christian civilization; and until Bishop Hopkins can prove the perfect righteousness of slavery as a Divine institution, we prefer to believe that it is a foul iniquity worthy only of the deepest barbarism. Again, it is objected to slavery that it is a sin *per se*. And his answer to this is that there is more vice and sin in New York than in all the South. (p. 12.) We shall let New York take care of this libel, and beg to say that it is no answer to the objection. Man-stealing, man-selling, and man-breeding in slaves remain as a confessed and revealed sin, even if the city of New York is drunken, licentious and profane. And last of all, comes up the question of property in slaves, as an objection to slavery, which the Bishop again considers on the score of *service* and of *social inequality*. (p. 12.) He boggles at it, and pulls up his legs out of the mire with heroic energy, as if conscious of his failing strength; and yet it remains <sup>1</sup>true that all labor, whether for life or for a short time of service must

be paid, by the direct ordinance of God. No device of man can ever set aside this fundamental principle of God's government as it respects service and labor, not even the ingenious device of Bishop Hopkins and his Southern friends.

"How would you like to be a slave?" is the *argumentum ad hominem*, which the worthy Bishop considers in the fifth place as one of the popular objections to slavery. (p. 13.) And he answers it by saying, that the slaves in the South are far happier and in a better condition than the slaves of the King of Dahomey. This is only an argument as to *one system of slavery being better than another*, and no argument at all in favor of the Divine institution of slavery, in itself considered. It may all be true enough that slavery in the Southern States is far better than it is in the kingdom of Dahomey; but does that make it true that God has instituted it in one place more than in the other? It is a case of special pleading which the Bishop has not yet entirely forgotten since the days that he practised the art. It would have been far better for the cause of truth and righteousness, if the Bishop had been employed as counsel for the other side of the question. He will pardon us for referring to his legal acumen, and for his dexterity in managing his case, on the score that he is now a Bishop who has forsaken the law for the Gospel.

And, last of all, this catalogue of objections, which the Bishop so triumphantly <sup>ast</sup>ates, is, that of the separation of husbands and wives, parents and children, as involved in slavery. His answer is, that laboring men, military and naval men are long separated from their wives and children. But they are not sold into perpetual bondage, and sent far away where sight of wives and children shall never more greet their eyes and gladden their hearts. And therefore it is no parallel case. It is, simply, some more of the Bishop's special pleading.

Bishop Hopkins closes his political pamphlet on his Bible view of slavery, with a pathetic homily, or part of homily, about the Christian Church and himself as advocates of the system of human bondage; and he promises to give us another book on Fathers and Councils, as they relate to the subject. In a more recent letter he threatens to give a brother bishop and his clergy the unenviable notoriety of being published to the world in his forthcoming book. We grant the Bishop his perfect ability of making both himself and others notorious, but we doubt his ability of making anything or anybody famous. However, as we may be mistaken on this last point, we humbly beg of his lordship that he may include this review with the name of its writer, which appears in the list of his protestants, in that immortal work, so that both may have some chance of going down to posterity.













